



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The

# American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AT CHARLESTON AND COLUMBIA

OF sixteen cities in which the American Historical Association has met since its earliest days in Saratoga, only one was as small as Charleston; but, as the President of the South Carolina Historical Society rightly said in his interesting address of welcome, it may easily be maintained that no American city of the size has been the scene of so many historical events of such importance. The remembrance of these events combined with the historical buildings and the picturesque domestic architecture of Charleston to make it an exceedingly interesting place in which to hold the annual meeting of an historical society; and the interest was heightened by the pains which the local committee of arrangements took, with most intelligent hospitality, to ensure that members should see the sites and buildings that would chiefly appeal to them, and should know their history. Similar pains were taken by the Association's hosts at Columbia, which also has its historic memories; and the automobile ride around the capital of South Carolina will take rank beside the steamboat excursion to Fort Sumter, in the remembrance of those who attended. Among other hospitable attentions, the reception offered by the South Carolina Historical Society at Charleston and the sumptuous luncheon of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce are especially to be recorded, and the kindness with which the authorities of the Citadel, of the Confederate Home and College, and of the Charleston clubs, threw open their doors to members, or, in the case of the first-named, provided abundant rooms for sessions. Two days, Monday December 29 and Tuesday December 30, were spent in sessions at Charleston, the last day of the year in sessions at Columbia. That between the two came a night train leaving Charleston at 3:20 a. m. was a painful incident of the occasion, and, though few who attended would willingly have missed seeing either city, it

must in general be hoped that meetings divided between two places will seldom occur hereafter.

Though Charleston and Columbia are farther from the geographical centre of the Association's membership than any city in which meetings have previously been held, save New Orleans, the attendance was greater than might have been expected. There was a registration of 208 at Charleston, and a few more appeared at Columbia. Nearly a third of the attendance was of Southern members. To the remainder a large element was contributed by the special train which came down from New York, bringing a party of seventy-six. As in the similar case of the special train to New Orleans ten years before, these had, besides the pleasure of seeing each other at greater leisure than is possible during the meetings, the opportunity for visits to interesting cities on the way—a forenoon at Richmond, an afternoon at Petersburg and its battlefield, and on the return a day in Washington.

In any summing-up of the pleasures of the meeting, members would certainly wish that the most especial thanks should be expressed to the two committees of local arrangements—that at Charleston, headed by Hon. Joseph W. Barnwell, and that at Columbia, of which Mr. B. F. Taylor was chairman—and to the committee on programme, under the chairmanship of Professor St. George L. Sioussat, of Vanderbilt University.

In quality the programme was excellent, in quantity, as is usually the case, excessive. No doubt committees on programme start out each year with excellent views respecting the merits of simplicity, but it is difficult to maintain them against the pressure of specialists, prone to think more of their own specialties than of the benefits of listening to thoughts lying outside their customary spheres. Eleven "conferences", in eleven different fields, were laid down upon the programme, besides the usual joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and two other general sessions. Such an arrangement, not uncommon of late, means three "conferences" carried on simultaneously each morning, and three each afternoon, bringing often to irreverent lips an unseemly comparison to the educational institutions of Messrs. Forepaugh and Ringling, whose methods prove distracting to even the hardest minds. Of the eleven conferences, five were simple readings of papers, without time or without plan for discussion. The most lively discussions occurred in those conferences which were pedagogical in intention. Those which took place in the somewhat jejune conference of historical societies and in that of archivists suffered from the usual defect, that most participants rather described their own practices than entered on a

broader consideration of the general themes; but this is because of that isolation of such workers which it is the very purpose of these conferences to correct.

Of these conferences, three took place on the first morning of the session, that on historical materials, that on the social and industrial aspects of modern history, and that on American religious history. In the first of these, presided over by Hon. Joseph W. Barnwell, president of the South Carolina Historical Society, the opening paper was by Mr. Worthington C. Ford of the Massachusetts Historical Society, whose theme was Manuscripts and Historical Archives. The purport of his paper was to call attention to the increasing accumulation of records of an administrative character, the tendency to save what is of only secondary value as historical material, and the evil effects of not having these records utilized at once by competent officials, especially fitted to digest and interpret them. The circumstances of administration have altered. The telegraph and newspaper have changed the character of general correspondence, so that the letter of to-day will be less interesting historically than the letter of a century ago. Much of state activity can be recorded in compressed form provided our civil service is of adequate quality, and the duplication and unnecessary accumulation which constitute our present embarrassment and danger can thus be avoided.

Mr. Charles Henry Hart of Philadelphia followed with a most interesting paper, illustrated with lantern slides, on Frauds in Historical Portraiture, or Spurious Portraits of Historical Personages. Mr. Hart claimed for his subject an importance and an expanse of field far beyond what is commonly supposed. Emphasizing the value of portraiture as a guide to the understanding of historical personalities, he showed however how frequently portraiture had been misnamed by "fraud, accident, and mistake", from the spurious portrait of Christ, of the fifth century, down. He stated that the earliest authentic portrait, from life, of a known person was the fresco of Dante by Giotto, in the Bargello at Florence, but dwelt chiefly upon portraits relating to America. Referring to the spurious portraits of Columbus, William Penn, Roger Williams, signers of the Declaration of Independence by wholesale, the Sully portrait of Patrick Henry, the hundred spurious portraits of Washington, and many others down to a Columbus in Chicago altered to President McKinley, he made a strong plea for thorough investigation and verification before acceptance of a counterfeit presentment as a true representation of the subject claimed for it.

Still another variety of historical material was discussed by Dr. Charles O. Paullin of the Department of Historical Research in the

Carnegie Institution of Washington, in a paper<sup>1</sup> on Materials for an Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States, which, as is known, that department is producing under his supervision. After speaking of the work already accomplished in this undertaking, Dr. Paullin gave the general headings of a proposed table of contents, and then described the maps and materials, classified under each head. The general headings are, physical geography, aborigines, early maps of America, routes of explorers and colonizers, boundaries and divisions, industrial and social maps, political maps, maps of cities, and military maps. The importance and labor of determining county boundary lines, for the purposes of several of these varieties, were dwelt upon, the preliminary steps involving compilation from the statutes of each state relative to county boundaries and the procuring of all available maps showing the lines, physical features, and local monuments to which the statutes refer. The insufficiency of the material relating to social and industrial history for the colonial period, and the lack of uniformity in that presented for the period since censuses began, were pointed out. Professor Frederic L. Paxson of Wisconsin, in discussion of Dr. Paullin's paper, spoke of the need for a complete series of outline county maps of the United States, since the constant classification of census and election statistics is by counties. Decennial county maps appeared to him insufficient. He thought there ought to be a map for each year of congressional elections; and hoped that the editors would find it possible to present a compilation of geographic statistics and conditions rather than a series of historical essays in the form of maps. Mr. Barnwell, commenting on the several papers, called attention to the untrustworthiness of the census of 1870 in the southern states.

The conference on the social and industrial aspects of modern history, presided over by Professor James T. Shotwell of Columbia University, which met on the same morning, proved of interest to a very considerable number. The opening paper of the conference, by Dr. Walter P. Hall of Princeton, *Social Forces in English Politics in the Early Nineteenth Century*, discussed the social philosophy which dominated England at the beginning of the century, and showed how the complete failure of this *laissez-faire* philosophy to ameliorate the evils incident upon the use of the factory system had evoked three new schools of thought, the Tory socialists, the trade unionists, and the Owenites. The first of these succeeded in passing the Factory Acts, but was defeated in the new Poor Law; the trade unionists did much to change the prevailing attitude toward the *laissez-faire* doctrine, but they soon narrowed their influence; while

<sup>1</sup> Printed in the *History Teacher's Magazine* for March.

the followers of Robert Owen attempted to establish co-operative communities, a union of all the workers, and labor exchanges, and failed in all three respects. The study of this early reaction against the *laissez-faire* philosophy not only helps us to understand the conditions of the nineteenth century but makes clear the source of many present-day social theories.

Dr. James Sullivan of the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, followed with a paper on Social and Industrial History in Colleges and Schools, in which he dwelt on the lack of text-books which adequately discuss this aspect of history. He emphasized the dryness of history to a student who finds his text but a collection of political or military facts which cannot be correlated with his every-day life.

The discussion which ensued was opened by Professor Herbert D. Foster of Dartmouth, who agreed that social and industrial history must be taught, but argued that as yet there was no consensus of opinion as to what should be included in their domain. The answer to the question, "What are they?" would clear away much of the difficulty. Professor Arthur I. Andrews of Tufts College cited various points in the usual course of teaching political history, such as the Crusades, the commercial endeavors of explorers and discoverers from the time of the Portuguese voyages, the French Revolution, and the revolt of the Dutch against Spain, as offering ample opportunity for somewhat extended work along social and industrial lines. Miss Helen L. Young of the New York Normal College spoke of the necessity of building a framework of political history about which to group social factors. She also cited the lack of material in English for social studies of any country other than England as the greatest difficulty in such teaching. Mr. J. Lynn Barnard of the School of Pedagogy reached the conclusion that the text-books must be re-written to answer social and economic questions rather than political ones, since our life to-day is chiefly concerned with the social and economic and therefore our interest is in those aspects of life in the past. Miss Mildred Thompson of Vassar also held that the emphasis in the writing and teaching of history must be shifted from the political to the social and industrial point of view. She stated her belief that the students' dislike of history was the result of mistaken emphasis and could be speedily overcome if the vital economic facts were but made more prominent. Dr. Frederick Duncalf, of the University of Illinois, agreed in the main with this but believed that already history was meeting the demands made on it for social and economic training. Professor Marshall S. Brown, of the University of New York, dwelt on the danger of allowing the pendulum to swing too far, and of overestimating the importance of economic history

as much as it has been previously underestimated. The same view was maintained by Dr. Albert T. Olmstead of the University of Missouri, whose belief was that historical thinking was best secured by training in political history. Miss Katherine Wickers, of the Maury High School, Norfolk, Virginia, added a word on the necessity for the teaching of social and industrial history to the child in the grammar grades, to whom political history was of little value. The consensus of opinion of the conference seemed to be that moderation of zeal for social and industrial studies would result in a wise balance between social, industrial, and political history.

In a conference on American religious history, held the same morning, Dr. J. F. Jameson, who presided, read the first paper, entitled *Reasons for Studying American Religious History*. The reasons dwelt upon were more especially those which might appeal to laymen, partly because the conference consisted of lay teachers of history (the professional students of church history attending rather the sessions of the American Society of Church History at New York), and partly because of the exceptional extent to which the development of religious organizations in America has been in the hands of laymen. Reasons for the study of American religious history in elementary and high schools were considered as well as those applicable to instruction in colleges and universities. Among the reasons cited, aside from those related to the importance of the subject, was its value as a means toward teaching fairness of mind.

Professor Christopher B. Coleman of Butler College, Indianapolis, followed with a suggestive paper on *Some Salient Features of American Christianity*, a title justified by the development in the United States of a distinctive phase of Christianity marked by certain American characteristics. Among the influences which have produced these distinctive features of our religious life four were particularly noted: religious liberty, resulting in the voluntary system and in spontaneous development, the frontier, with its natural emphasis upon a partisan God and upon democracy, immigration in so far as it has involved the transplanting of religious ideas and institutions from Europe, and climatic and geographic forces, which perhaps have given us a more variable, a less imaginative, and a less aesthetic type of Christianity than that of Europe. Among the more salient features of American Christianity, attention was called to the conservatism of its theology, to its engrossment in practical problems and in organization, to the relative intensity of its religious interests, and to the evolution of new and even revolutionary interpretations of Christianity. Thus, Mormonism, with its literalism, materialistic monism, polygamy, and political activity is largely the product of

frontier conditions, while on the other hand Christian Science with its denial of matter, its spiritualistic monism, its effort to eliminate pain and sickness, its emphasis upon the feminine element, is largely the product of an old, well-to-do community, with few external dangers and hardships, and with a numerical predominance of women over men.

In a paper on Christianity and Slavery in the American Colonies, Professor Marcus W. Jernegan of the University of Chicago traced the development of the notion that the enslaving of infidels by Christians was justified on the ground that the former might be brought under the influence of Christianity. He showed that certain decisions of English courts, based on the principle that infidel negroes could be held as slaves in England, but when baptized and domiciled as inhabitants became free, led to the notion that in the American colonies also, a baptized slave could claim freedom; and that therefore, in order to encourage the Christianization of the negro, acts were passed denying that baptism of a slave conferred freedom. It was shown that masters generally, before 1730, opposed religious instruction of their slaves. Various causes, economic, political, and social, were mentioned. It was believed that such instruction would bring an increase in the cost of keeping slaves, that increased knowledge would make them less governable, and that more social privileges would be demanded. Other hindrances to Christianization of slaves were pointed out, such as lack of clergymen, ignorance on the part of the slaves, and acts passed to prevent them from assembling. The attitude of various religious denominations was discussed, respecting the holding of slaves by members, their conversion, baptism, and right to participate in church affairs. At the time of the Revolution perhaps less than ten per cent. had been even nominally Christianized.

Professor Evarts B. Greene of the University of Illinois, in a paper on the Anglican Outlook on the American Colonies in the Early Eighteenth Century, said in substance: The first decade of the eighteenth century was marked by the effort of the Anglican churchmen to strengthen the church in the colonies. For this work the active agent was the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, which turned its energies both to the colonists and to the Indians. The missionaries were, however, prone to neglect the Indians for the more attractive work among the colonists. In their work the agents of the society often came into contact, sometimes into conflict, with the Puritans and the Quakers, both of whom they regarded as in need of religious teaching because of their neglect of the sacraments of the church. But the work of the church in the

colonies was greatly hampered by the lack of a bishop in America and the failure of the movement to establish an American episcopate was of vital political importance as depriving the colonies of a powerful conservative force.

The paper by Professor John S. Bassett of Smith College, on the Popular Churches after the Revolution, related to the whole period from 1783 to 1811, and chiefly to the South. The Protestant Episcopal Church, though prosperous in the North, was at the end of the Revolution in a state of suspended animation in the South. This was due not so much to disestablishment or the departure of Tory clergymen as to the character of the colonial clergy, and their cold and lifeless preaching. While the Episcopal Church was in this moribund state in the South the popular churches gained a strong footing with the middle-class farmers. Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists were the leaders in the movement. The minor churches played the same rôle, yet acted locally. The Scotch-Irish and the Highlanders who settled in the South were stanch Presbyterians, and the Presbyterians of New Jersey and Philadelphia also sent missionaries to many Southern communities. A few congregations of Baptists appeared on the coast very early. Somewhat later the Philadelphia Baptist Association sent missionaries to Virginia and in 1756 a third Baptist movement appeared, inspired by leaders from New England. The Methodists had been growing rapidly throughout the South since 1764, their advance guided by leaders sent over by Wesley. The fact that this was a new organization, having as yet no factions to harmonize, that its doctrines were easily understood, that its methods were revivalistic, and its organization flexible, all aided its growth. The fervent character of the popular preaching in the South probably made an enduring impression on the thinking of the Southern middle class.

Taken all together, the efforts made to interest a lay audience in American religious history, even though many things necessarily dwelt upon in such a presence are things already familiar to specialists, seems to have been distinctly successful.

The afternoon of the first day at Charleston was, like the morning, marked by three conferences, one on the relations of the United States and Mexico, the conference of those interested in the work of historical societies, and a third devoted to modern English history.

The conference upon the relations of the United States and Mexico was presided over by Dr. Justin H. Smith, who read a paper upon Mexican Feeling toward the United States at the Beginning of 1846. To understand the matter, Mr. Smith said, it is essential, first

of all, to realize the characteristics of the Mexicans. Temperamentally the Mexicans were sentimental, sociable, and under excitement reckless. Lax regarding the substance of things, but devoted to forms, they were disposed to regard Americans as boorish, calculating, aggressive. It was practically impossible for them to gauge aright the directness of the Anglo-Saxon mind, and they could not fail to impute to us designs we did not entertain. We must understand also the effect of experience, education, environment, and habits—for instance, of Spain's isolating policy. Our diplomatic intercourse with Mexico, which seemed likely for a number of reasons to be cordial, began disastrously, and a series of diplomatic difficulties followed. We were believed to covet her territory, and the secession of Texas was attributed to atrocious greed on our part. Our claims, growing out of outrages against American citizens, increased the tension. For personal reasons Mexican politicians added to it. We were despised as dull-witted, spiritless, and in a military sense impotent; and it was believed that European interests would be a protection to Mexico. Almost all influences, therefore, at the beginning of 1846, tended toward hostility against the United States.

Professor Eugene C. Barker read next a paper upon the relations between the United States and Mexico in the period from 1835 to 1837. Anglo-Americans, he said, who emigrated to Texas between 1821 and 1835 broke no real ties with the United States and formed none with Mexico; accordingly they turned naturally to the United States for aid. The relations between those two countries centred around four considerations: the non-enforcement by the United States of its neutrality law, the claim of the United States to the Neches instead of the Sabine boundary, the occupation of Nacogdoches (Texas) by United States troops commanded by General E. P. Gaines in the summer and fall of 1836, and the recognition of Texan independence. Mr. Barker pointed out that there were palpable violations of neutrality on the part of the United States and that the administration manifested only a lukewarm desire to enforce it and the local officials none at all; that the claim to the Neches boundary was absolutely groundless; that Gaines's occupation was not necessary on any account, although he was apparently honest in thinking so, and the administration seems to have wished him to go no further than the maintenance of absolute neutrality and the fulfillment of treaty obligations to Mexico. In recognizing Texan independence, however, the United States was reasonably deliberate, and acted in conformity with established precedent, although in all its correspondence with Mexico the State Department was unnecessarily curt and unsympathetic, which tended further to convince that government of the insincerity of the United States.

The third paper in this conference was presented by Professor R. M. McElroy of Princeton University and dealt with the relations of Jackson, Houston, and Tyler to the Annexation of Texas. The central idea of the paper was that Andrew Jackson was the dominant force in the movement to "regain Texas". His motive was described, not as a desire to serve the interests of the slave-holding states, but as a determination to regain a territory which he believed to have been "wantonly and corruptly ceded from us". He firmly believed that George W. Erving, our minister to Spain, had, just before Jackson became president, negotiated with Spain a treaty recognizing the Rio Grande as the ancient limit of Louisiana, and that President Adams had interfered, closed the negotiations, and set our western boundary at the Sabine. So believing, Jackson held that the secret rejection of Erving's supposed treaty nullified the treaty which took its place. The latter half of the paper traced the history of Jackson's efforts to bring Texas back to the American Union. His view clearly was that Mexico never had any real claim to Texas, but that Texas was merely a bit of stolen property which the United States was at liberty to regain in any manner she might choose, a view which makes it easy to conceive of his sending Houston thither to create revolution, and doing so without conscious sacrifice of honesty. The paper also touched upon Jackson's influence with President Tyler. It was followed by a paper by Mr. Edward H. Thompson of Mérida, Yucatan, dealing with the present relations between the United States and Mexico.

The tenth annual conference of historical societies and organizations of similar purpose was presided over by Dr. Thomas M. Owen, director of the Department of Archives and History in Alabama. The secretary of the conference, Dr. Solon J. Buck, made the usual report upon the progress of the historical societies of the country, as evidenced by the data which he had received in response to the annual circulars. The large increase in the provision of buildings for historical agencies in the United States, the organization of the Michigan Historical Commission, and of state historical surveys in connection with the states of Illinois and Indiana were commented upon. Dr. Dunbar Rowland of Mississippi read the report of the Committee of Seven on Co-operation of Historical Societies and Departments in the Mississippi Valley, conveying the report of Mr. W. G. Leland upon the catalogue of documents in the archives of Paris relating to the history of the Mississippi Valley, a compilation which is approaching completion, and may be expected to reach its conclusion in a few months. The history of organized historical work in the Lower South was made the first theme of the conference.

Professor Yates Snowden of the University of South Carolina gave a general survey of the history of the historical societies of that region, and Dr. Dunbar Rowland an account of the organization and work of the historical commissions and departments supported by the states. These papers were supplemented by remarks on the part of Mr. R. D. W. Connor of Raleigh on the work, acquisitions, and new installation of the North Carolina Historical Commission; by Professor M. L. Bonham, jr., of Baton Rouge, on the history of the Louisiana Historical Society, of the Louisiana Historical Association, and of the archives and historical commissions of that state; by Dr. Owen on the need of better supervision in the South of county and other local archives, to secure better making and keeping and installation of records, with further remarks on the historical museum and the collecting of portraits; by Mr. George S. Godard, state librarian of Connecticut, and others.

Finally, a paper on Planning the Publication Work of Historical Agencies was read by Professor Clarence W. Alvord of the University of Illinois. He urged that the published work of historical societies and institutions should be so organized that successive volumes of documentary material edited in a scholarly manner should be brought forth for a number of years on a plan carefully matured and covering all the discoverable sources. He discussed the various categories embraced in such a comprehensive plan, disapproved strongly of all fortuitous volumes and miscellaneous collections, and indeed of all forms of partial publication. Mr. Alvord's doctrine, applicable to Illinois and other states which stand at the beginning of documentary publication, was criticized by Mr. Worthington C. Ford as one that would not work well in the older states where much has already been published, much comes to light from time to time, much can never be completed, so that publications cannot always be made systematic and there is a distinct field for miscellaneous volumes, and those of fortuitous construction. Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, while commending the high standards advocated by Dr. Alvord, pointed out that good work depended on ideals, money, and the man, and not all three can always be commanded. He adverted to the inconveniences produced to librarians, readers, and students by miscellaneous collections which defy treatment in accordance with subject-matter, and advocated a certain measure of courage in breaking away from the stereotyped traditions of "Collections".

The sixth of this busy day's conferences, devoted to modern English history, had as its *pièce de résistance* a single paper, by Professor A. L. Cross of Michigan, on Legal Materials as Sources for the Study of Modern English History. His general thesis was

that while some good work has been done on certain phases of English legal history, the materials on the subject offer much opportunity for the study of the development of political thinking, and of social and industrial conditions, furnishing sources of information which have been only inadequately exploited. These materials fall into three general groups. The first includes the reports of the common-law courts and of chancery, which incidentally throw much light on contemporary life and, particularly in the case of the charges and opinions of the judges, reflect current political views and enable the student to trace the evolution of judge-made law. Secondly, since the activities of the justices of the peace touch on almost every conceivable subject of local administration, an investigation of the records of quarter sessions promises a rich harvest which thus far has been only incompletely gathered. Although a few of these records have been printed, the bulk of them still remain in manuscript. Finally, the manorial rolls and other kindred documents admirably supplement the records of the public local courts. Furthermore, they show that the judicial and administrative business of the private jurisdictions was more extensive and survived longer than was commonly supposed before Sidney and Beatrice Webb published their *English Local Government*, a work which not only is a vast store-house of information, but suggests many fertile fields for further enquiry.

In the discussion which followed the reading of this paper Professor Carlton H. Hayes of Columbia University dwelt upon the fact that the great bulk of such material as this made a sense of relativity one of the most necessary qualifications for the student, who must also exercise care in dealing with these sources because of the class prejudices by which they are affected. Professor Charles H. McIlwain of Harvard was not disposed to think that the judges always favored the gentry, pointing out the fact that in the Tudor period they frequently supported the lower classes. He too commented on the vast amount of material both printed and unprinted, and spoke of the necessity of studying it as a whole, not for detached illustrations. Professor James T. Baldwin of Vassar drew upon his experiences to point out the difficulties in using legal material—its discouraging volume, and the archaic form and technical character of the documents. While a collaboration in the work of publication was greatly to be desired, there was still, he believed, an opportunity for individual students dealing with subjects of limited scope to achieve excellent results. Professor Cross closed the discussion with a few remarks in which he agreed with Professor McIlwain that the judges were frequently in sympathy with the lower classes.

At the general public session of the whole society, held in the evening in Hibernian Hall, a felicitous address of welcome was made by Hon. Joseph W. Barnwell, as president of the South Carolina Historical Society. He touched upon the leading points in the history of Charleston, with an eloquence which made all who heard him sensible of the dramatic quality of the events, and of the economic and social meaning of the conditions, which he described. The presidential address of Professor Dunning, which then followed, was heard with manifest appreciation and delight by a large audience of the Charleston public and of the members of the Association. In accordance with the custom of this journal, it has already been printed in our January number.

On the second morning, the vigorous sons and daughters of history, unwearyed by six conferences and an evening session, proceeded bravely to a fresh day's programme embracing three morning conferences, a trip to Fort Sumter, the annual business meeting, and an evening session. The three conferences displayed upon the morning's *menu* related respectively to the teaching of history, colonial commerce, and military history.

In the conference on the teaching of history Professor J. G. deRoulhac Hamilton presided. Professor Nathaniel W. Stephenson of the College of Charleston read the first paper of the conference, on the Place of History in the Curriculum. He set for himself two questions, Why is history in the curriculum? and, What work is it to do there? In answering the first question Professor Stephenson discarded many tests—history is not primarily for the purpose of inculcating principles of conduct, it is not to laud the deeds of our ancestors, it is not, in the secondary schools, to be treated as a descriptive science. We find that our own historical interests fall into three classes: a vivid interest in the story of history, in the triumphs of man over circumstances; an interest in tracing and analyzing those events of the past that shall explain the present; and lastly the pleasure of research. The first of these we possess in early childhood, and it should form the touchstone of the history teaching of the grammar grades; with care the analytic faculty should be brought into play in the high school; research should be left for later years. And in the teaching of history, from the kindergarten to the university, the one thing needful is imagination.

Professor Henry Johnson of Teacher's College followed with a paper on Making the Past Real, in which he dwelt upon the use of pictures and illustrative material, and urged the use of museums and of existing buildings which would actually connect the past and the present. He also advised intensive work on the locality in which

the child lives, as an aid in vitalizing his history. Professor Beverley W. Bond, jr., of Purdue University, discussed the work in history of the Summer School of the South at Knoxville, as showing the possibilities of summer school work. In former years the work has consisted of lectures and conferences; this year there was added a history exhibit, which included pictures, maps, note-books, and atlases, as well as text-books, source-books, and reference books. It is intended in future years to add practical work with the reflectoscope, the stereoscope, and the stereopticon.

In the discussion which followed Professor Frederic L. Paxson, without commenting on the papers which had been read, set forth the view that the work of the high schools must be limited and standardized. Miss Mary S. Smith contrasted Southern problems resulting from the rural population, the small numbers of the foreign-born, the necessity of a double school system, with the conditions in such a state as Massachusetts. The great need of the Southern schools is good teachers. This Professor Milledge L. Bonham also emphasized, urging that the university must develop the thinking teacher. Universities must put great emphasis on subject-matter, before students are ready to consider method. Professor St. George L. Sioussat placed much of the responsibility for poor teaching in the high schools at the door of the colleges, since their requirements varied widely. The first step in standardizing teaching must be to standardize college entrance requirements. Professor Herbert D. Foster thought that agitation toward these ends might be taken up by the various teachers' associations. Mr. Edward C. Page of the State Normal School of DeKalb, Illinois, cited as a successful practical experiment a museum conducted in that normal school. Professor Arthur I. Andrews cited the collections of the New England History Teachers' Association now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and invited members of the Association to visit it.

The conference on colonial commerce was marked by but one main paper, that of Professor Charles M. Andrews on that general theme. The paper, to be published at a later time in this journal, opened with remarks upon the necessity of maintaining in colonial history a point of view not derived from subsequent events. A proper treatment of the fundamental and normal characteristics of our first period would bring into the foreground the total history of colonial commerce, as a theme of equal importance with the political and constitutional aspects of our early history. The starting-point should be a proper presentation of the colonial policy of Great Britain, of which a thorough comprehension should be obtained, as well as of the ideas underlying this policy, of the institutions and

systems to which it gave rise, and of its relations to the legal and financial history of the colonies. As a second part of his general subject, Professor Andrews discussed commerce as a dominant interest of the colonists themselves, apart from its connection with the British policy, but without limitation to the thirteen colonies, examining at length four subjects: staple products, shipping, trade-routes, and markets, regarding which as yet but little had been written by historical scholars, though ample material existed for their examination.

Professor O. M. Dickerson, of the State Normal School, Winona, Minnesota, discussed Professor Andrews's paper at some length. While the programme of investigation proposed by Professor Andrews might, he thought, change the whole organization of colonial history, he could not admit that commercialism dominated our colonial middle ages any more completely than it does to-day. For instance, seventy-five per cent. of the vetoes of colonial laws must be explained on other grounds. In addition to the organizing principles suggested by Professor Andrews, namely, the royal prerogative and commerce, he thought that at least three others should be recognized, the growth of local self-government, the westward movement, and the development of imperial interests. Mr. Frank W. Pitman of Yale University adverted to the importance of the history of a developing demand in Europe for sugar, tobacco, and other colonial products, pointing out that foreign markets were of vital importance to the colonies. Dr. Clarence P. Gould of Wooster University discussed the economic grouping of colonial lands as manifested in the contraction or expansion of the tobacco belt, concurrent with the variations in the price of food-stuffs and tobacco.

In the conference on military history, Mr. Theodore D. Jersey of Charleston read a paper on Charleston during the Civil War, concerning himself principally with an account of blockade-running and its practical results. Not only was blockade-running conducted on an extensive scale through the port of Charleston in the earlier years of the war, but, contrary to commonly accepted opinion, even to the closing of the war the business carried on through Charleston was greater, it appears, than through any other Confederate port. The evidence also indicates that the capital engaged in the business was largely Carolinian and not English, as has been supposed. Mr. Jersey presented many facts of interest concerning individual firms and vessels engaged in the traffic.

The second paper in this conference was a careful and interesting account by Captain Oliver Spaulding, U. S. A., of the bombardment of Fort Sumter. The situation in Charleston harbor in

1860, the condition of Fort Moultrie and the federal garrison there, the transfer to Sumter and the reasons for it, the relief expeditions and their failure, the preparations for the siege, and finally the bombardment and the surrender, were all set forth with admirable clearness. The Confederate preparations for the siege were also described, though less minutely. Naturally Captain Spaulding treated the subject largely from a technically military point of view.

In a paper on the teaching of Military History in the Army, by Captain Arthur L. Conger, U. S. A., the place of military history in general history, and the importance of critical historical study to professional military men, especially in developing capacity for leadership, were briefly discussed. The elementary courses in history at West Point, the graduate work at the Army Service Schools at Fort Leavenworth, and such historical study as is conducted at the Army War College at Washington, were described in considerable detail, particularly the seminary research work conducted at Fort Leavenworth. The paper concluded with a statement of the unsatisfactory nature of the editing of the *Official Records* of the Union and Confederate Armies in the Civil War.

At the close of this paper the Committee on Military History presented a report commending the Fort Leavenworth methods and recommending the adoption of similar work at the Army War College, the encouragement of seminary work in military history at the universities, and, in case of the establishment of an historical section of the General Staff, the co-operation of military and civilian historians.

Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, assistant secretary of the Navy, addressed the conference on the unsatisfactory provision now existing for the naval archives of the United States, and on the desire of the two military departments of the government, in the editing of the military records of the Revolution, to produce a publication marked by all possible excellences of preparation and editing.

Reserving to a later point in this article an account of the business meeting, to which the latter part of Tuesday afternoon was devoted, we may pass to the second of the general or public evening sessions. Illness prevented Hon. H. A. M. Smith, judge of the United States district court, from reading his promised paper on the Psychology of Historical Research, and the first paper of the evening was one in which Dr. Edmund C. Burnett, of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington, gave a history of the Committee of the States, appointed by the Continental Congress to oversee the Continental business during the summer of 1784. Though provided for by the Articles of Confedera-

tion, the Committee of the States had not hitherto been called into being, and as the experiment proved to be a failure, partly because of jealousies and partly because of indifference, it was never tried again. Its appointment was desired by Jefferson and others for the purpose of preserving a visible federal head during the adjournment. While it largely failed to accomplish its immediate purpose or anything else of importance and soon disintegrated, nevertheless its very failure was of value because it emphasized the need of a better constitution. The history of the committee given by Dr. Burnett was mainly drawn from the letters of the delegates to Congress which the Carnegie Institution is assembling and will ultimately publish with a view to supplementing the insufficient knowledge of the proceedings of Congress which may be obtained from the journals.

Professor Wilbur H. Siebert, of the Ohio State University, followed with a paper entitled, *What became of the Loyalists at the Close of the Revolution?* He told from original investigations the story of the organized Loyalist bands, of the border rescuing expeditions and the migrations which by 1791 had increased the English population of Lower Canada to 20,000 and that of Upper Canada to 25,000, of the refugees in London and Halifax, of the short-lived Loyalist colony on the Penobscot, and of the foundation of New Brunswick. From the Southern cities, Charleston and Savannah, the Loyalists found asylum in the West Indies, Bermuda, and the Floridas. Many of those who had taken refuge in the Floridas poured into the Bahamas when the Floridas passed to Spain, increasing the population of those islands by several thousand. From both Northern and Southern ports about 2000 refugees probably were received in England.

In a paper of distinctively Carolinian subject, the *Return of John C. Calhoun to the Senate in 1845*, Professor James E. Walmsley, of Winthrop College, after sketching briefly the state of politics in the period immediately preceding, presented a letter written by Calhoun to Major Burt on September 17, 1845. Calhoun had retired from the Senate in 1842. In 1844 he had been defeated in respect to the presidential nomination, largely through the influence of Thomas Ritchie and Robert J. Walker. In the spring of 1844 he entered Tyler's Cabinet, but was not retained by Polk, and seems at that time to have desired to retire from politics. But the pressure of his friends and his own alarm at the possible dissolution of the Union induced him to consider re-entering the Senate. This is the point of view that is made prominent in the letter mentioned above. Calhoun felt that no matter what his personal preferences might be, his state at this time had vital need of his services. With a few exceptions

the newspapers of South Carolina voiced this opinion and commended Judge Huger's conduct in resigning in order to make a place for Calhoun.

The last of the papers read at Charleston was that of Professor Archibald Henderson of the University of North Carolina, entitled, somewhat broadly, the Creative Forces in Westward Expansion. The westward movement, he said, resulted from two forces, one acquisitive the other inquisitive. The former found expression in organizations of men of wealth designed to explore, colonize, and develop the western wilderness; the latter arose from the instinct of the hunter and explorer and found incarnation in the frontier backwoodsman. He then proceeded to show, from a research into the careers of Daniel Boone and Richard Henderson, the co-ordination of these two elements in the westward expansion. From the records of Rowan County, North Carolina, was shown the relationship between these two: Boone, impoverished by many lawsuits, turning for assistance to Henderson, an attorney of that county, Henderson organizing for purposes of exploration the company first called "Richard Henderson and Company", later the Louisa, and then the Transylvania Company. In 1764 Boone made his first exploration in Kentucky, hunting and trapping on his own account, and prospecting and exploring on behalf of Henderson's land company. In 1769, after a conference at Salisbury of Boone, Henderson, and other Kentucky explorers, Boone entered on his explorations of 1769-1771, the main object of which was really to recruit his shattered fortunes by acting as scout and confidential agent of Henderson and his company in the examination of lands in Tennessee and Kentucky.

In Columbia, the next morning, occurred the usual joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, presided over by Professor James A. James as president of the latter body, and opened with an address of welcome by the mayor of Columbia, Hon. Wade Hampton Gibbes. Three papers were read. The first, by Professor Isaac J. Cox of Cincinnati, dealt with the relation between General Wilkinson and Governor Folch. The paper, which later we shall have the opportunity of printing at length, is based on material recently discovered in the Spanish and Mexican archives. Beginning with a secret interview between Wilkinson and Folch in 1804, the writer showed how Wilkinson secured the renewal of his pension from Spain by promising to assist the Spanish authorities to make the transfer of Louisiana useless, by informing them of the future plans of the American government. It traced the processes by which during the next three years Wilkinson plotted alternately for and against the interests of both nations, with self-seeking so treach-

erous that finally no one but Jefferson seemed to trust him, the climax being reached by Jefferson's commissioning him in 1809 as his envoy to the Captain General in Cuba and to Governor Folch to propose an alliance to which Spanish America, Brazil, and the United States, and even Great Britain should be parties.

The second paper was by Professor Clarence E. Carter of Miami University, on Some Aspects of British Policy in West Florida, mainly relating to the attempts to establish settlements in the region added to that province by the change of boundary, from 31° N. lat. to the Yazoo, effected in 1764. The narrative tended to exhibit the government's management of this province as marked by the same indecision and the same lack of insight and vision which so vitiated its efforts at a solution of the general problem of imperial organization.

Dr. Arthur C. Cole's paper on the South and the Right of Secession in the Early Fifties was occupied chiefly with the alignment of parties on the question of the right of secession, as that question was raised in the local contests in the Southern states just before and just after the Compromise of 1850. The Whigs and Democrats reversed the ground occupied in 1832. The Whigs were fairly well united in the denial of any right of secession, but asserted the inalienable right of revolution as an ultimate remedy. The victory of the Union Party in the Lower South in the elections of 1851 did not mean the defeat of the doctrine of secession but was due to divisions among the Democrats.

The two conferences which marked the afternoon, and with which the sessions of the Association were concluded, had each to be crowded into a single hour on account of two non-scientific reasons—the elaborateness of the luncheon given by the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, and the necessity of beginning the automobile ride at four o'clock. The conference of archivists, presided over by Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, chairman of the Public Archives Commission, was almost fatally compressed, so far as discussion was concerned. The chairman stated that the commission expected to append to its annual report for 1913 reports on the archives of California and Wyoming, and a list of Reports and Representations of the Board of Trade to the King in Council, Parliament, Secretary of State, etc., and that preliminary arrangements had been made for reports on the archives of South Carolina and Vermont. Specimens of the commission's proposed "Primer of Archival Economy for the Use of American Archivists" were presented in the form of two tentative chapters, the first, on Archives, by Professor Charles M. Andrews, and the fifth, on Fixtures, Fittings, and Furniture, by

Mr. Paltsits; but there was no time for discussing them. Some remarks were made on the present status of the movement for a National Archive Building in Washington. Dr. Solon J. Buck presented a paper on the Advantages and Disadvantages of Centralizing Local Archives at the State Capital. His belief was that, with regard to many large classes of local material not much needed for immediate purposes of local business, the interests of history were best served by their removal to a central depository, where trained archivists and systematic arrangements were more likely to be provided. The paper was discussed by Mr. Connor, Mr. Salley, Dr. Owen, and Dr. Rowland, custodians of archives in North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi, respectively, and by others.

The conference by formal resolution gave expression to its hope that the state of South Carolina would go forward rapidly in the work of publishing the archival materials for the earlier history of the state.

The conference on ancient history, presided over by Professor Lewis P. Chamberlayne of the University of South Carolina, had papers by Dr. Ralph V. D. Magoffin of Johns Hopkins University, on the Modern Making of Ancient History, by Dr. Frank B. Marsh of the University of Texas, on the Problem of Provincial Administration under the Roman Republic, and by Dr. Richard F. Scholz of the University of California, on the Antecedents of the Holy Roman Empire. Mr. Magoffin's paper passed in rapid review a number of the newer sciences, auxiliary to the researches of the student of ancient history, and then gave more in detail, from both published and unpublished material, a variety of instances illustrating the value which numismatics, epigraphy, and archaeology have for that student.

The problem of provincial administration under the Roman Republic, as stated by Dr. Marsh, lay in the difficulty of reconciling a foreign policy resulting in annexations with the strong reluctance of the Senate to enlarge its own numbers or the general machinery of government. He showed how this reluctance checked Roman expansion in the period before the conquest of 146 B. C., and again how at a later period, the half century preceding 63 B. C., when new annexations had exhausted the new governors at the Senate's disposal even under the system of pro-magistrates, that body again became opposed to a policy of imperial expansion.

The effort of Dr. Scholz's paper was to trace the antecedents of the medieval universal state from the monarchy of the first world-king and god-king, Alexander, with its alliance of altar and throne, through the development of cults of Hellenistic god-kings, organized

deification at Rome, the Messianic ideal, and the political-religious empire of Augustus. Professor Olmstead of Missouri remarked on the need of paying due regard to the history of the subject peoples, not as local history, but in its setting and as a contribution to imperial history.

It remains to describe the annual business meeting of the Association, held on the afternoon of the second day at Charleston, with President Dunning in the chair. The report of the secretary showed a total membership of 2843. The treasurer reported net disbursements of \$9893, with net receipts of \$10,261. The total assets of the Association were \$27,283, a slight gain over the preceding year. The report of the Executive Council described steps taken toward additional promotion of historical research, the prospective establishment of a headquarters for members of the Association engaged in work in the archives and libraries in London, the establishment of a standing committee upon the study of the military history of the United States, and the offer of \$200 as a prize, to be awarded in December 1915, for the best essay in military history submitted in that year. The Association accepted the offer and appointed a committee of award. Upon recommendation by the Council it was voted that the meeting of December 1915 be held in Washington; that of December 1914, it will be remembered, is to be held in Chicago. Some preparations were announced for the additional meeting which is to be held in California in the summer of 1915, Mr. Rudolph J. Taussig being made chairman of the committee on local arrangements and Professor Ephraim D. Adams of the committee on programme. The budget for 1914 was also presented. The Council announced the re-election of J. F. Jameson as a member of the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, he being the member whose six-year term expired at the end of the year 1913.

The report of the Pacific Coast Branch was offered by Professor Edmond S. Meany, who gave a brief account of the recent meetings of that branch at Los Angeles and Seattle. Brief reports were presented on behalf of the Historical Manuscripts Commission by its chairman, Mr. Worthington C. Ford, and on behalf of the Public Archives Commission by its chairman Mr. Victor H. Paltsits; the substance of the latter report has been mentioned above. The committee on publications reported especially as to the series of prize essays, which is in a fair way to sustain itself. The report of the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, presented by its chairman Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, related chiefly to its new circular to reviewers. Professor Henry Johnson, for the advisory board of the *History Teacher's Magazine*, reported grati-

fying progress of that journal in public favor. The committee on bibliography announced that the execution of the proposed bibliography of American travels is now assured, Dr. Bernard C. Steiner having undertaken to be its editor. Reports were also made on behalf of the committee on a bibliography of modern history by Professor A. L. Cross, a member of that committee; by Dr. J. F. Jameson, as editor of the series of *Original Narratives of Early American History*; and on behalf of the general committee by Professor Frederic L. Paxson, chairman. The chairman of the Herbert Baxter Adams prize committee, Professor Burr, announced that the committee had awarded the prize to Miss Violet Barbour for an essay entitled "Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington".

The report of the committee on nominations appointed at the last annual meeting was read, in the absence of its chairman, Professor William MacDonald, by Professor C. W. Alvord, a member of the committee. The committee presented the following nominations for officers and members of the Council for the year 1914, and all were unanimously elected by the Association: President, Andrew C. McLaughlin; first vice-president, H. Morse Stephens; second vice-president, George L. Burr; secretary, Waldo G. Leland; treasurer, Clarence W. Bowen; secretary of the Council, Evarts B. Greene; curator, A. Howard Clark; elective members of the Executive Council, Herman V. Ames, Dana C. Munro, Archibald C. Coolidge, John M. Vincent, Frederic Bancroft, and Charles H. Haskins. A vote expressing appreciation of the disinterested and efficient manner in which Professor Haskins had for a long period of years, 1900 to 1914, conducted the difficult and laborious office of secretary of the Council was passed by the Association in view of his retirement from that position.

Over this matter of the nominations there arose an unexpected discussion which, whether the criticisms out of which it sprang were or were not warranted, was salutary in its effects, as must usually be the case in discussions within such a society, whose business meetings are apt to be marked by excess of preparedness, smoothness of action, and harmonious acquiescence. Dr. Rowland of Mississippi, declaring his entire contentment with the nominations actually made, criticized as insufficient the methods taken by the nominating committee for eliciting the opinions of the membership, painted with some warmth of rhetoric the dangers of oligarchy, and advocated the timely sending out to the members of blank forms of ballot, preparatory to the next meeting. In reality the danger of oligarchical control over the particular matter commented on seemed slight, for the Council had made no communication to the committee and no

member of the Council had received from the latter any statement as to what nominations were about to be made. It will be remembered that, by what was certainly an improvement over former practice, the committee on nominations had been appointed a year in advance, with the request that members of the Association should write to it during the year as to their opinions or desires respecting nominations. Professor Alvord described the efforts, not inconsiderable in sum, which those of his committee had made to inform themselves as to the views of members. In the discussion which followed, it was pointed out that the general issue of blank ballots had three times been tried in former years, but had produced no other result than thirty or forty or fifty responses, casual, nowise representative, and, if taken seriously, open to the danger of suffering elections to be dictated by a clique acting by surprise. It was declared by various speakers that, in this age of waste-baskets, it was vain to expect useful results from any ballot by mail in a society so large. Universal appreciation of the ends desired by Dr. Rowland was expressed throughout the debate, which was entirely amicable, and at the end the new committee on nominations, about to be appointed for 1914, was charged to consider and report upon means for better eliciting the general opinion. The list of appointments by standing committees, made by the Council, was then read. It is printed at the end of this article. It is not too much to say, that the announcement of a nominating committee headed by the name of Professor Hull gave universal confidence that whatever could be done to allay any existing dissatisfaction with respect to nominations would be done, with all possible fairness, thoughtfulness, and ingenuity.

Thus the incident ended well.<sup>2</sup> But the general question as to oligarchical control deserves a little consideration. In making such an accusation, it is evidently not the composition of the committees which is in mind. Leaving out of account the Board of Editors of this REVIEW, which under the agreement the Council cannot alter save at the expiration of six-year terms, the number of members on the present committee list is 92, and of these only 36 appear on the list of two years ago. Dr. Rowland's charge is, virtually, that the Council controls the affairs of the Association and is not changed rapidly enough. But in large societies the conduct of business almost always rests in the hands of a small group, composed of those most

<sup>2</sup> Ended, so far as discussion before the Association was concerned. But, deeming the episode not to have been sufficiently laid before the public in Professor Fay's excellent article on the meeting, in the *Nation* of January 8, 1914, Dr. Rowland set forth his views in a letter to that journal, in whose issues of January 22, 29, February 5 and 26, the matter was therefore further, and to all appearance quite sufficiently, discussed by various members.

interested and most willing to spend the time needful to do the work. Each of us belongs to several societies the management of which he leaves to others, content if they seem not to mismanage and if they have no power to perpetuate themselves in office. In the American Historical Association, according to the experience of the writer of these pages (who has watched its proceedings throughout its thirty years, eighteen years from outside the Council, twelve years from within), it has never happened that any considerable number of members has been dissatisfied with any specific thing the Council has done; while as to perpetuating themselves in office or controlling the elections, it is significant that in thirty years no member has cared to make any other nomination than those propounded by the nominating committee, though any member could at any time do this. Clearly there has been no great degree of dissatisfaction.

A good degree of permanence in the Council there certainly has been, partly due to the presence of a group of ex-presidents, hardy perennials, placed there by the constitution, partly due to a policy of the Association which has its reasons. If those most earnest to have the society do its best work have believed in a relatively permanent board of management, it is for no other reason than those which have led nearly all other learned societies administering funds for scientific work to follow the same course. When the Association was founded, some desired that we should have a small learned academy of history, some that we should have a large popular society. Prosperous financially, at the end of thirty years, we are able to do, and are trying to do, the work of both. Those whose minds are most intent on the fifteen or twenty interesting and important tasks which the Association is trying to perform in a scholarly manner will place a high value on experience, and will think the great democratic principle of rotation in office as little applicable to the Executive Council as to the National Academy of Sciences. But others may choose to regard the offices as sources of honor rather than sources of labor, and certainly they have also that aspect, and certainly the Association belongs to its members, and the money is theirs, and if they wish more rapid changes in the Council they have only to make them. But the belief of the present writer is, that if the business meetings can be so conducted as to allow ample time for explaining what the Council has done and the reasons, contentment will prevail, and a system not widely divergent from the present will continue to be maintained, for he has never known a person to attend for the first time a meeting of the Council and emerge from it with any other feeling than that its members had been acting thoughtfully and in the interest of the whole Association.

J. F. J.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION

<i>President</i> ,	Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, Chicago.
<i>First Vice-President</i> ,	Professor H. Morse Stephens, Berkeley.
<i>Second Vice-President</i> ,	Professor George L. Burr, Ithaca.
<i>Secretary</i> ,	Waldo G. Leland, Carnegie Institution, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.
<i>Treasurer</i> ,	Clarence W. Bowen of New York (ad- dress, 1140 Woodward Building, Wash- ington).
<i>Secretary to the Council</i> ,	Professor Evarts B. Greene, Urbana, Ill.
<i>Curator</i> ,	A. Howard Clark, Smithsonian Institution.

*Executive Council* (in addition to the above-named officers):

Hon. Andrew D. White, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, <sup>1</sup>
President James B. Angell, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Frederick J. Turner, <sup>1</sup>
Henry Adams, <sup>1</sup>	Professor William M. Sloane, <sup>1</sup>
James Schouler, <sup>1</sup>	Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, <sup>1</sup>
James Ford Rhodes, <sup>1</sup>	Professor William A. Dunning, <sup>1</sup>
Charles Francis Adams, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Herman V. Ames,
Rear-Admiral Alfred T. Mahan, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Dana C. Munro,
Professor John B. McMaster, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Archibald C. Coolidge,
Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, <sup>1</sup>	Professor John M. Vincent,
J. Franklin Jameson, <sup>1</sup>	Frederic Bancroft,
Professor George B. Adams, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Charles H. Haskins.

*Committees:**Committee on Programme for the Thirtieth Annual Meeting:*

Professor James W. Thompson, University of Chicago, chairman; Evarts B. Greene, William E. Lingelbach, Charles H. McIlwain, Albert T. Olmstead, Frederic L. Paxson.

*Committee on Local Arrangements:* Charles L. Hutchinson, chairman; James A. James, secretary; Edward E. Ayer, Abram W. Harris, Edmund J. James, Harry P. Judson, Otto L. Schmidt.*Committee on Nominations:* Professor Charles H. Hull, Cornell University, chairman; George M. Dutcher, Wesleyan University; John H. T. McPherson, University of Georgia; Mrs. Lois K. Mathews, University of Wisconsin; Joseph Schafer, University of Oregon.

<sup>1</sup> Ex-presidents.

*Editors of the American Historical Review:* Andrew C. McLaughlin, chairman; George L. Burr, Edward P. Cheyney, J. Franklin Jameson, James H. Robinson, Frederick J. Turner.

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Worthington C. Ford, Massachusetts Historical Society, chairman; Clarence W. Alvord, Herbert E. Bolton, Julian P. Bretz, Archer B. Hulbert, William O. Scroggs.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor Claude H. Van Tyne, University of Michigan, chairman; Carl R. Fish, J. G. deRoulhac Hamilton, Allen Johnson, William MacDonald.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Professor Charles D. Hazen, Smith College, chairman; Laurence M. Larson, William R. Shepherd, Paul van Dyke, Albert B. White.

*Public Archives Commission:* Victor H. Paltsits, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Eugene C. Barker, Gaillard Hunt, Alexander S. Salley, jr., Jonas Viles, Henry E. Woods.

*Committee on Bibliography:* Professor Ernest C. Richardson, Princeton University, chairman; Clarence S. Brigham, W. Dawson Johnston, Walter Lichtenstein, Bernard C. Steiner, Frederick J. Teggart.

*Committee on Publications:* Professor Max Farrand, Yale University, chairman; and (*ex officio*) Worthington C. Ford, Evarts B. Greene, Charles D. Hazen, J. Franklin Jameson, Waldo G. Leland, Victor H. Paltsits, Ernest C. Richardson, Claude H. Van Tyne.

*General Committee:* Professor Frederic L. Paxson, University of Wisconsin, chairman; Arthur I. Andrews, Solon J. Buck, Isaac J. Cox, George N. Fuller, Samuel B. Harding, Marcus W. Jernegan, Orin G. Libby, Harlow Lindley, Wallace Notestein, Clarence S. Paine, Louis Pelzer, Morgan P. Robinson, Otto L. Schmidt, Eugene M. Violette, George M. Wrong, and Waldo G. Leland and William A. Morris, *ex officio*.

*Committee on a Bibliography of Modern English History:* Professor Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Ernest C. Richardson, Williston Walker.

*Committee on the Preparation of Teachers of History in Schools:* Kendric C. Babcock, University of Illinois, chairman; Charles E. Chadsey, Edgar Dawson, Robert A. Maurer, Dana C. Munro.

*Conference of Historical Societies:* Clarence Burley, chairman; Solon J. Buck, secretary.

*Advisory Board of the History Teacher's Magazine:* Professor Henry Johnson, Columbia University, chairman; Fred M. Fling, James Sullivan (re-elected to serve three years); Miss Blanche Hazard, George C. Sellery, St. George L. Sioussat.

*Committee on Military and Naval History:* Professor Robert M. Johnston, Harvard University, chairman; Assistant Secretary Henry Breckinridge, Fred M. Fling, Rear-Admiral Austin M. Knight, Brigadier-General Hunter Liggett, Major James W. McAndrew, Charles O. Paullin, Assistant Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt.

*Committee on the Military History Prize:* Captain Arthur L. Conger, Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, chairman; Milledge L. Bonham, jr., Allen R. Boyd, Fred M. Fling, Albert Bushnell Hart.